



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,348	07/20/2005	Sitke Aygen	P70555US0	1732
136 7590 03/09/2009 JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC 400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004				
EXAMINER NATNITHITHADHA, NAVIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3735				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/532,348

Applicant(s)

AYGEN, SITKE

Examiner

NAVIN NATNITHITHADHA

Art Unit

3735

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. According to the Amendment, filed 02 January 2009, the status of the claims is as follows: Claims 1 and 2 are currently amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, pp. 3-5, filed 02 January 2009, with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghoos, GB 2360845 A ("Ghoos"), have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As to claims 1 and 2, it is not clear how Applicant's method, as described in the originally filed specification, dispenses with body-related conversion factors.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is not clear what the steps of the method are. Appropriate correction is required. For example, a proper, clear method step would be "A method for determining gastric emptying of a patient, comprising: orally administering a test substance; measuring said test substance's dwelling time in a stomach of patient;..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because these are method or process claims that do not transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing, nor are they tied to another statutory class (such as a particular machine). See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981) (quoting *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 70); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978) (citing *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). See also *In re Comiskey*, 499 F.3d 1365, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (request for rehearing *en banc* pending).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ben-Oren et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,338,444 B2 ("Ben-Oren").

Claim 1: Ben-Oren teaches the following:

a method for determining the gastric emptying by orally administering a test substance and measuring its dwelling time in the stomach (see Abstract), characterized in that increase of $^{13}\text{CO}_2$ in the exhaled respiratory air is determined before and after the oral administration of free ^{13}C -octanoic acid in a form bound to egg yolk together with a standardized test meal (see col. 3, l. 57, to col. 4, l. 51, and col. 19, ll. 61-67), wherein body-related conversion factors are dispensed with, and characterized in that said test meal consists of a fried egg into which the free ^{13}C -octanoic acid is stirred (see col. 19, ll. 61-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Oren, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ghoos, GB 2360845 A ("Ghoos").

Claim 2: Ben-Oren teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above. Ben-Oren does not teach "whereupon said test meal is eaten together with a slice of toasting bread, 5 to 10 g of margarine or butter, followed by drinking 150 ml of water or coffee".

However, Ghoos teaches the following:

a method for determining the gastric emptying by orally administering a test substance and measuring its dwelling time in the stomach (see Abstract), characterized in that the increase of 13002 in the exhaled respiratory air is determined before and after the oral administration of free 13C-octanoic acid in a form bound to egg yolk together with a standardized test meal (see p. 6), whereupon said test meal is eaten together with a slice of toasting bread, 5 to 10 g of margarine or butter, followed by drinking 150 ml of water or coffee (see p. 6).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ben-Oren's test meal to have the test meal taught by Ghoos because Ghoos' test meal, which

considered a standardized test meal in the prior art, is within the scope of Ben-Oren's parameters for a test meal (see Ben-Oren, col. 4, ll. 20-44).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The other patents cited in the PTO-892 teach subject matter related to the Applicant's claims. The Examiner suggests reviewing these patents before responding to the present Office Action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NAVIN NATNITHITHADHA whose telephone number is (571)272-4732. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor, II can be reached on (571) 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Navin Natnithithadha/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3735
03/03/2009